



## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

August 28, 2000

### **H.R. 2798** **Pacific Salmon Recovery Act**

*As ordered reported by the House Committee on Resources on July 26, 2000*

#### **SUMMARY**

Assuming appropriation of the authorized amounts, CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 2798 would cost the federal government \$600 million over the next three years. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. H.R. 2798 contains no private-sector or intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA).

H.R. 2798 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide grants for salmon conservation and habitat restoration projects. For this purpose, the bill would authorize appropriations of \$200 million for each of fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003. The funds would be divided among the states of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho and the Indian tribes in those states.

#### **ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 2798 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation would fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

|                                          | By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars |      |      |      |      |      |
|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                          | 2000                                   | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| <b>SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION</b> |                                        |      |      |      |      |      |
| Spending Under Current Law               |                                        |      |      |      |      |      |
| Budget Authority <sup>a</sup>            | 58                                     | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Estimated Outlays                        | 19                                     | 20   | 19   | 0    | 0    | 0    |
| Proposed Changes                         |                                        |      |      |      |      |      |
| Authorization Level                      | 0                                      | 200  | 200  | 200  | 0    | 0    |
| Estimated Outlays                        | 0                                      | 200  | 200  | 200  | 0    | 0    |
| Spending Under H.R. 2798                 |                                        |      |      |      |      |      |
| Authorization Level <sup>a</sup>         | 58                                     | 200  | 200  | 200  | 0    | 0    |
| Estimated Outlays                        | 19                                     | 220  | 219  | 200  | 0    | 0    |

a. The 2000 level is the amount appropriated for that year for similar grants to Alaska, California, Oregon, and Washington and several Indian tribes in those states. The grants were made under a one-year authorization for salmon recovery grants contained in Public Law 106-113, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000.

## **BASIS OF ESTIMATE**

For this estimate, CBO assumes that H.R. 2798 will be enacted at the beginning of fiscal year 2001 and that the full amounts authorized will be appropriated for each year. CBO further assumes that each of the eligible states and tribes will submit the necessary plans and agreements in 2001. The estimate of outlays reflects the bill's requirement that money be transferred promptly to each eligible state and tribe once the department has approved its plan.

**PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS:** None.

## **ESTIMATED IMPACT ON STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS**

H.R. 2798 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA. The bill would benefit Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and tribal governments located in those states, by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to grant them funds for salmon conservation and habitat restoration.

## **ESTIMATED IMPACT ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR**

The bill contains no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

### **ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:**

Federal Costs: Deborah Reis

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Victoria Heid Hall

Impact on the Private Sector: Sarah Sitarek

### **ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:**

Robert A. Sunshine

Assistant Director for Budget Analysis